1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA** 8 9 NATHAN WILLIAMS, 10 Petitioner, 3:17-cv-00365-HDM-WGC 11 VS. **ORDER** 12 JOE GENTRY, et al., 13 Respondents. 14 15 In this habeas corpus action, brought pro se, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, by Nathan 16 17 Williams, a Nevada prisoner, the respondents filed a motion to dismiss on October 3, 2017 (ECF 18 No. 9). Williams' response to the motion to dismiss has been suspended, pending the resolution of a 19 motion for production of documents that he filed on November 15, 2017 (ECF No. 16). See Order 20 entered November 16, 2017 (ECF No. 17). 21 In his motion for production of documents, Williams requests that respondents be ordered to 22 produce the following three documents: "Exhibit 94; Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus (Post-Conviction), filed 23 8/16/16, Nevada Supreme Court, Case No. 71033;" 24 "Order Denying Petition, Filed 10/13/16, Nevada Supreme Court, Case No. 71033 (Exhibit 95);" and 25 "Exhibit 96; Notice in Lieu of Remittitur, Filed 11/07/16, Nevada Supreme 26 Court Case No. 71033."

Motion for Production of Documents, p. 1. On December 5, 2017, the respondents filed a response to the motion for production of documents (ECF No. 19), and, with that response, respondents filed copies of the three documents requested by Williams.

As the three documents Williams requests have now been filed, and served upon Williams, Williams' motion for production of documents is moot, and it will be denied on that ground. The Court will, therefore, set a deadline for Williams to respond to the motion to dismiss.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that petitioner's Motion for Production of Documents (ECF No. 16) is **DENIED** as moot.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that petitioner will have 60 days from the date of this order to file a response to the motion to dismiss (ECF No. 9). In all other respects, the schedule for further proceedings set forth in the order entered August 1, 2017 (ECF No. 5) will remain in effect (respondents will have 30 days to file a reply to Williams' response to the motion to dismiss).

Dated this 29<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2017.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Howard & Mikilles